

REMARKS

Claims 1, 5-7, 9-28, 30-35, 37-44, and 46-51 remain pending

In the Office Action, claims 11-28, 30-35, 37-41, and 45-51 are allowed; claims 1, 5-7, and 10 are rejected; and Claims 8 and 9 are objected to. The limitations of claim 8 have been incorporated into independent claim 1; claim 8 has, accordingly, been cancelled. Claim 1 now has the same scope as former claim 8, which was held allowable.

Applicants note that claim 45, listed as allowed, was cancelled in the last filed amendment (mailed November 27, 2006). Also, the status of claims 42-44, currently pending, is not listed in the Office Action. No rejection is made for these claims, which are dependent on allowed claim 30; thus, Applicants believe claims 42-44 should be in condition for allowance.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 5, and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(a), 102(e) and 102(b) as being anticipated by Dybkjær (U.S. Pat. No. 6,218,038 B1). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection as applied to the claims as amended.

Applicants have amended claim 1 to incorporate the limitation of 8, which was allowable but rejected for depending on a rejected claim. Thus, claim 1 is now equivalent to claim 8 rewritten as an independent claim.

Claims 5 and 10 now depend on an allowable claim, and so are also allowable. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims as amended.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claim 6 stands rejected as being unpatentable over Dybkjær (U.S. Pat. No. 6,218,038 B1) in view of Yamaoka et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,630,109). This rejection is traversed in view of the amendment made to underlying claim 1.

Claim 7 stands rejected as being unpatentable over Dybkjær (U.S. Pat. No. 6,218,038 B1) in view of Singh et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,523,483). This rejection is traversed in view of the amendment made to underlying claim 1.

Claims 6 and 7 now depend on an allowable claim base, and are, therefore, also in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims as amended.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully ask the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the outstanding rejection. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600 or directly at (248) 641-1220.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: April 4, 2007

By: Anna M. Budde
Anna M. Budde
Reg. No. 35085

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600